

1 **QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP**

2 Robert W. Stone (Bar No. 163513)
3 robertstone@quinnemanuel.com
4 555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor
5 Redwood Shores, California 94065
6 Telephone: (650) 801-5000
7 Fax: (650) 801-5100

8 Adam B. Wolfson (Bar No. 262125)
9 adamwolfson@quinnemanuel.com
10 50 California Street, 22nd Floor
11 San Francisco, California 94111
12 Telephone: (415) 875-6600
13 Fax: (415) 875-6700

14 *Attorneys for Defendant Corcept Therapeutics, Inc.*

15 **DUANE MORRIS LLP**

16 Lucas C. Wohlford (admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
17 100 Crescent Court, Suite 1200
18 Dallas, TX 75201
19 Telephone: +1 214 257 7200
20 Facsimile: +1 214 257 7201
21 E-Mail: lwohlford@duanemorris.com

22 *Attorney for Defendant Optime Care Inc.*

23 [Additional Counsel Listed On Signature Page]

24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
7710
7711
7712
7713
7714
7715
7716
7717
7718
7719
7720
7721
7722
7723
7724
7725
7726
7727
7728
7729
7730
7731
7732
7733
7734
7735
7736
7737
7738
7739
7740
7741
7742
7743
7744
7745
7746
7747
7748
7749
7750
7751
7752
7753
7754
7755
7756
7757
7758
7759
7760
7761
7762
7763
7764
7765
7766
7767
7768
7769
7770
7771
7772
7773
7774
7775
7776
7777
7778
7779
77710
77711
77712
77713
77714
77715
77716
77717
77718
77719
77720
77721
77722
77723
77724
77725
77726
77727
77728
77729
77730
77731
77732
77733
77734
77735
77736
77737
77738
77739
77740
77741
77742
77743
77744
77745
77746
77747
77748
77749
77750
77751
77752
77753
77754
77755
77756
77757
77758
77759
77760
77761
77762
77763
77764
77765
77766
77767
77768
77769
77770
77771
77772
77773
77774
77775
77776
77777
77778
77779
77780
77781
77782
77783
77784
77785
77786
77787
77788
77789
77790
77791
77792
77793
77794
77795
77796
77797
77798
77799
777100
777101
777102
777103
777104
777105
777106
777107
777108
777109
777110
777111
777112
777113
777114
777115
777116
777117
777118
777119
777120
777121
777122
777123
777124
777125
777126
777127
777128
777129
777130
777131
777132
777133
777134
777135
777136
777137
777138
777139
777140
777141
777142
777143
777144
777145
777146
777147
777148
777149
777150
777151
777152
777153
777154
777155
777156
777157
777158
777159
777160
777161
777162
777163
777164
777165
777166
777167
777168
777169
777170
777171
777172
777173
777174
777175
777176
777177
777178
777179
777180
777181
777182
777183
777184
777185
777186
777187
777188
777189
777190
777191
777192
777193
777194
777195
777196
777197
777198
777199
777200
777201
777202
777203
777204
777205
777206
777207
777208
777209
777210
777211
777212
777213
777214
777215
777216
777217
777218
777219
777220
777221
777222
777223
777224
777225
777226
777227
777228
777229
777230
777231
777232
777233
777234
777235
777236
777237
777238
777239
777240
777241
777242
777243
777244
777245
777246
777247
777248
777249
777250
777251
777252
777253
777254
777255
777256
777257
777258
777259
777260
777261
777262
777263
777264
777265
777266
777267
777268
777269
777270
777271
777272
777273
777274
777275
777276
777277
777278
777279
777280
777281
777282
777283
777284
777285
777286
777287
777288
777289
777290
777291
777292
777293
777294
777295
777296
777297
777298
777299
777300
777301
777302
777303
777304
777305
777306
777307
777308
777309
777310
777311
777312
777313
777314
777315
777316
777317
777318
777319
777320
777321
777322
777323
777324
777325
777326
777327
777328
777329
777330
777331
777332
777333
777334
777335
777336
777337
777338
777339
777340
777341
777342
777343
777344
777345
777346
777347
777348
777349
777350
777351
777352
777353
777354
777355
777356
777357
777358
777359
777360
777361
777362
777363
777364
777365
777366
777367
777368
777369
777370
777371
777372
777373
777374
777375
777376
777377
777378
777379
777380
777381
777382
777383
777384
777385
777386
777387
777388
777389
777390
777391
777392
777393
777394
777395
777396
777397
777398
777399
777400
777401
777402
777403
777404
777405
777406
777407
777408
777409
777410
777411
777412
777413
777414
777415
777416
777417
777418
777419
777420
777421
777422
777423
777424
777425
777426
777427
777428
777429
777430
777431
777432
777433
777434
777435
777436
777437
777438
777439
777440
777441
777442
777443
777444
777445
777446
777447
777448
777449
777450
777451
777452
777453
777454
777455
777456
777457
777458
777459
777460
777461
777462
777463
777464
777465
777466
777467
777468
777469
777470
777471
777472
777473
777474
777475
777476
777477
777478
777479
777480
777481
777482
777483
777484
777485
777486
777487
777488
777489
777490
777491
777492
777493
777494
777495
777496
777497
777498
777499
777500
777501
777502
777503
777504
777505
777506
777507
777508
777509
777510
777511
777512
777513
777514
777515
777516
777517
777518
777519
777520
777521
777522
777523
777524
777525
777526
777527
777528
777529
777530
777531
777532
777533
777534
777535
777536
777537
777538
777539
777540
777541
777542
777543
777544
777545
777546
777547
777548
777549
777550
777551
777552
777553
777554
777555
777556
777557
777558
777559
777560
777561
777562
777563
777564
777565
777566
777567
777568
777569
777570
777571
777572
777573
777574
777575
777576
777577
777578
777579
777580
777581
777582
777583
777584
777585
777586
777587
777588
777589
777590
777591
777592
777593
777594
777595
777596
777597
777598
777599
777600
777601
777602
777603
777604
777605
777606
777607
777608
777609
777610
777611
777612
777613
777614
777615
777616
777617
777618
777619
777620
777621
777622
777623
777624
777625
777626
777627
777628
777629
777630
777631
777632
777633
777634
777635
777636
777637
777638
777639
777640
777641
777642
777643
777644
777645
777646
777647
777648
777649
777650
777651
777652
777653
777654
777655
777656
777657
777658
777659
777660
777661
777662
777663
777664
777665
777666
777667
777668
777669
777670
777671
777672
777673
777674
777675
777676
777677
777678
777679
777680
777681
777682
777683
777684
777685
777686
777687
777688
777689
777690
777691
777692
777693
777694
777695
777696
777697
777698
777699
777700
777701
777702
777703
777704
777705
777706
777707
777708
777709
777710
777711
777712
777713
777714
777715
777716
777717
777718
777719
777720
777721
777722
777723
777724
777725
777726
777727
777728
777729
777730
777731
777732
777733
777734
777735
777736
777737
777738
777739
777740
777741
777742
777743
777744
777745
777746
777747
777748
777749
777750
777751
777752
777753
777754
777755
777756
777757
777758
777759
777760
777761
777762
777763
777764
777765
777766
777767
777768
777769
777770
777771
777772
777773
777774
777775
777776
777777
777778
777779
777780
777781
777782
777783
777784
777785
777786
777787
777788
777789
777790
777791
777792
777793
777794
777795
777796
777797
777798
777799
7777100
7777101
7777102
7777103
7777104
7777105
7777106
7777107
7777108
7777109
7777110
7777111
7777112
7777113
7777114
7777115
7777116
7777117
7777118
7777119
7777120
7777121
7777122
7777123
7777124
7777125
7777126
7777127
7777128
7777129
7777130
777

NOTICE OF DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR A PROTECTIVE ORDER

2 **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that Defendants Corcept Therapeutics, Inc. and Optime Care Inc.
3 will and hereby do jointly move for a protective order under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c)(1)
4 with respect to 33 non-party document subpoenas that Plaintiff Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. has
5 purported to propound around the country.¹ The Court should enter an order requiring Teva to
6 withdraw these subpoenas in full.

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

9 On January 16, 2025, Corcept learned that Teva was in the process of serving non-party
10 document subpoenas (each containing 13 identical requests) on various healthcare providers (*i.e.*,
11 doctors, nurse practitioners, and institutions that have or could prescribe Corcept’s Korlym
12 medication). Notably—and in violation of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 45(a)(4)—notice of the
13 subpoenas did **not** come from Teva itself. Given the lack of prior notice, on January 17, Corcept asked
14 that the six non-party subpoenas Corcept knew about be withdrawn. Three days later, on January 20,
15 Teva refused to withdraw the six subpoenas and then, surprisingly, claimed that it had in fact served—
16 or was serving—33 (not six) subpoenas. Despite Corcept’s request, Teva refuses to withdraw its
17 improperly served subpoenas and has refused to provide basic information such as when each
18 subpoena was actually served (if at all). Teva’s gamesmanship should **not** be countenanced, and the

1 Teva served at least one subpoena on January 16, 2025, making objections to that subpoena
2 potentially due by today: January 30, 2025 (14 days later). *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 45(d)(2)(B). Out of an
3 abundance of caution, Defendants submit this motion within the fourteen-day objection period to
4 preserve their rights vis-à-vis the non-party subpoenas. Defendants understand that the Court typically
5 refers discovery disputes to a Magistrate Judge but no Magistrate Judge is presently assigned to this
6 case for discovery purposes. Defendants are requesting such assignment concurrently herewith. To
7 the extent that the Court refers this motion to a Magistrate Judge or assigns one, Defendants will re-
8 submit this motion to the Magistrate Judge in accordance with that Magistrate Judge's individual
9 requirements for discovery disputes and briefs.

1 Court should issue a protective order requiring Teva to withdraw the 33 subpoenas. They are invalid
 2 for lack of notice, aim to circumvent first-party discovery by seeking Defendants' materials through
 3 non-parties, including before an ESI or Protective Order have even been entered, seek irrelevant and
 4 disproportionate information, and are an attempt to harass the recipients and disrupt Defendants'
 5 relationships with the non-parties.

6 **II. LEGAL STANDARD**

7 A party to an underlying case can seek a protective order under Rule 26(c) against subpoenas
 8 directed to non-parties. *City of San Jose v. JUM Glob., LLC*, 2018 WL 4520981, at *3 (N.D. Cal.
 9 Sept. 21, 2018). A party seeking a protective order may seek relief against all the non-party subpoenas
 10 in the court where the action is pending, which “has authority under Rule 26(c) to issue a protective
 11 order concerning the subpoenas no matter where compliance is required.” *Kovalenko v. Kirkland &*
 12 *Ellis LLP*, 2024 WL 664691, at *2 n.1 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 16, 2024). Unlike a motion to quash, “standing
 13 is not an issue” for a party seeking a protective order against a non-party subpoena. *Akkawi v. Sadr*,
 14 2022 WL 4484056, at *3 n.1 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 27, 2022). At most, the non-party subpoena need only
 15 seek irrelevant documents or confidential information of the moving party, or “put a strain” on the
 16 moving party’s “business relationships” with the non-parties. *See Loop AI Labs Inc v. Gatti*, 2016
 17 WL 787924 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 29, 2016); *Wahoo Int'l, Inc. v. Phix Dr., Inc.*, 2014 WL 3573400, at *7
 18 (S.D. Cal. July 18, 2014). A court may issue a protective order in favor of a party against the non-
 19 party subpoenas on grounds including relevance, burden, confidentiality, and harassment. *See, e.g.*,
 20 *Wahoo*, 2014 WL 3573400, at *3, *5.

21 **III. ARGUMENT**

22 As explained below, good cause exists for this Court to issue a protective order requiring Teva
 23 to withdraw the 33 subpoenas. Defendants have standing to seek that order. The subpoena recipients
 24 are healthcare professionals, some of whom maintain professional consulting or educational
 25 relationships with Corconcept and/or engage with Optime as to the writing and filling of prescriptions.
 26 Teva's subpoenas implicate Defendants' interests because they seek documents involving Defendants
 27 as well as their sensitive and confidential information, and the subpoenas threaten to put a strain on
 28 Defendants' relationships with the subpoena recipients. The subpoenas should be withdrawn because

1 they are procedurally invalid, inappropriately aim to prematurely circumvent first-party discovery,
 2 seek irrelevant and disproportionate information, and are harassing and disruptive.

3 **A. TEVA'S SUBPOENAS ARE PROCEDURALLY INVALID**

4 As a threshold matter, the Court should issue a protective order against Teva's non-party
 5 subpoenas because they are procedurally invalid. Rule 45 is clear: "notice and a copy" of a pre-trial
 6 non-party subpoena "must be served on each party" "**before** it is served on the person to whom it is
 7 directed[.]" Fed. R. Civ. P. 45(a)(4); *see also* Advisory Committee Note to 2013 Amendment.

8 Here, Teva did not do what Rule 45(a)(4) requires. Instead, Teva admits that it served at least
 9 six non-party subpoenas between January 16 and 17 without prior notice; it did not acknowledge
 10 service until January 20 (days after Corcept contacted Teva about them). That renders the subpoenas
 11 invalid. *See, e.g., Deuss v. Siso*, 2014 WL 4275715, at *4 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 29, 2014) (quashing non-
 12 party subpoenas because Rule 45(a)(4) requires pre-service notice, explaining that providing "a copy
 13 of the subpoena after service on the third party, or even at the same time as such service," does not
 14 suffice). Worse, the full scope of Teva's violation is not even clear, as Teva on January 20 claimed
 15 that it has served (or is serving) 33 subpoenas, but Teva has refused to confirm when each was actually
 16 propounded or served, making it impossible to determine whether the other subpoenas (beyond the
 17 six Corcept originally knew about) actually predate Teva's January 20 notice.

18 In response to subsequent requests for information, Teva claimed these issues were "trifles"
 19 and "an immaterial technical slip up" that has been cured because Teva provided notice on January
 20 of all 33 subpoenas after it was caught serving at least six without prior notice. That is wrong.
 21 Teva's claim it "provided notice . . . shortly after the subpoenas were served . . . does not alter the
 22 fact that [Teva] . . . violated a governing federal rule." *Elite Lighting v. DMF, Inc.*, 2013 WL
 23 12142840, at *3–4 (C.D. Cal. May 6, 2013) (quashing non-party subpoenas). Moreover, because Teva
 24 refuses to answer when it served each subpoena (if at all), it is unclear when the 14-day objection
 25 period for each subpoena began to run. As a result, Defendants were forced to quickly bring this
 26 motion—before this case has even been assigned a Magistrate Judge and prior to the entry of either a
 27 Protective or ESI Order—simply to protect their rights. Further, Rule 45(a)(4) requires that parties
 28 provide one another notice of subpoenas **before** they serve them to encourage transparency, reduce

1 gamesmanship, and prevent unnecessary chaos, all of which has now been frustrated by Teva's
 2 apparent "no harm, no foul" approach and refusal to provide basic information. While Teva cavalierly
 3 claims there is no prejudice—that is not the point, and is in any event wrong: Defendants were forced
 4 to bring this motion, and as discussed *infra*, Teva's subpoenas threaten to up-end first-party discovery,
 5 seek irrelevant and disproportionate information, and have disrupted both Defendants and the
 6 subpoena recipients themselves (who may decide it is not worth engaging with Defendants if the cost
 7 of doing so is Teva's dragging them into this lawsuit and subjecting them to voluminous discovery).

8 **TEVA'S SUBPOENAS SEEK TO END-RUN THE PARTIES' NEGOTIATIONS AND**
 9 **OBTAIN CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION PREMATURELY**

10 This case is still in its early stages. Defendants' motion to dismiss is set for hearing just several
 11 weeks from today (February 20, 2025), and the parties are continuing to discuss the 231 document
 12 requests and 31 interrogatories Teva has so far served on Defendants. The entry of foundational
 13 protocols like Protective and ESI Orders will best facilitate that process, but as Teva knows, those
 14 orders have not yet been fully agreed to, much less entered. Rather than wait for the parties to
 15 complete their discussions and present any remaining disputes to the Court or the Magistrate Judge,
 16 Teva apparently chose to circumvent that process by seeking discovery indirectly through 33 non-
 17 parties (all but two of whom are individuals). Teva's efforts should be rejected at this stage.

18 While the parties are continuing to discuss the ultimate scope of discovery that Defendants
 19 may provide, many of Teva's document requests to the non-parties are cumulative of information that
 20 Teva seeks from Defendants. For example, Request Nos. 1 and 2 to the non-parties seek "All
 21 Documents and Communications relating to" transfers of values between Defendants and the
 22 subpoena recipient, as well as "any agreements or contracts between You and Corcept or Optime[.]"
 23 Ex. A at 13. Similarly, No. 3 seeks "All Communications" between the subpoena recipients, Corcept,
 24 and Optime, concerning Korlym, Teva, and potential other generic manufacturers. *Id.* at 14. No. 6
 25 seeks communications between the subpoena recipients and Defendants related to government
 26 investigations, Nos. 7 and 8 seek documents regarding various services, tools, and resources
 27 Defendants provided to the non-party recipients, and Nos. 9 and 12 seek "marketing message[s],
 28 advertisements, or promotional materials" and "cost, safety, and/or efficacy" information relating to

1 Corcept's Korlym products. Ex. A at 14–15. Any contracts, payments, and communications *between*
 2 the subpoena recipients and Corcept and/or Optime may well be in Defendants' possession. The same
 3 is true as to marketing materials and cost, safety, and efficacy information related to Korlym.

4 Assuming the parties can agree on Protective and ESI Orders and narrow Teva's requests,
 5 Defendants may agree to search for such materials. If the parties are unable to reach agreement, they
 6 may well present any such dispute(s) to the Magistrate Judge for resolution. Either way, the prudent
 7 course is for the parties to continue their discussions, not for Teva to create uncertainty, sow chaos,
 8 and manufacture a race to production by prematurely seeking the same materials indirectly through
 9 the non-parties. *See Burns v. Bank of Am.*, 2007 WL 1589437, at *13–14 (S.D.N.Y. June 4, 2007)
 10 (explaining that “subpoenas under Rule 45 are clearly not meant to provide an end-run around the
 11 regular discovery process” and quashing subpoena to non-party seeking “precisely the same
 12 documents as demanded in” requests to defendant).

13 Moreover, many of the materials sought by Teva's requests to the non-parties cover
 14 Defendants' information that is *confidential and sensitive*. As one example, Teva's Request No. 2
 15 seeks contracts between the subpoena recipients and Defendants. Ex. A at 13. Nos. 5, 6, and 7 seek
 16 “Documents and Communications” concerning government investigations into Corcept and Optime.
 17 *Id.* at 14–15. Defendants' contracts (if any) with the subpoena recipients likely contain sensitive
 18 information which Defendants have an interest in protecting, as do materials produced in or relating
 19 to whatever government investigations there may be that involved Defendants. *See Novak & Gose,*
 20 *LLC v. Allstate Ins. Co.*, 2007 WL 5289731, at *10–11 (D. Ariz. Nov. 26, 2007) (partially granting
 21 party's motion for protective order against non-party document subpoena where subpoena might be
 22 “fishing for information” and explaining that party can properly seek protective order against non-
 23 party subpoena based on interest in “confidentiality” of its “business records”). Making matters
 24 worse, Teva's Request No. 6 even seeks investigation-related “Communications between You and
 25 Corcept or Optime—*including correspondence between counsel[.]*” Ex. A at 14. That likely
 26 implicates Defendants' privileged or otherwise protected common-interest communications. *See*
 27 *Cones v. Parexel Int'l Corp.*, 2018 WL 3046424, at *2 (S.D. Cal. June 20, 2018) (party can challenge
 28 non-party subpoena that seeks party's “potentially privileged or protected matter”). Defendants must

1 be permitted notice and meaningful opportunity to protect their information, not be cast aside by Teva.

2 That no Protective Order has yet been entered in this case only further compounds the above
 3 problems. For example, given Teva's apparent desire to keep Defendants out of the loop, it is
 4 unknown what Teva has advised the non-parties as to the lack of a Protective Order. If the non-parties
 5 were to produce Defendants' confidential information now *without* such an order, that might impede
 6 Defendants' ability to maintain that information as confidential. All of this confirms a Protective
 7 Order must first be agreed to (else litigated) before Teva's desired discovery could ever even be
 8 produced, providing another reason why Teva's subpoenas should not be allowed to proceed now.

9 **C. TEVA'S SUBPOENAS SEEK IRRELEVANT INFORMATION AND IMPOSE**
 10 **UNDUE BURDENS ON NON-PARTIES**

11 Separately, the Court should issue a protective order against Teva's non-party subpoenas as
 12 they seek information that is irrelevant and in any event disproportionate. Teva (a generic
 13 manufacturer) asserts antitrust claims against Corcept (Teva's competitor) and Optime (a pharmacy
 14 that distributes Corcept's products, and with whom Teva wishes to—but does not—deal). Teva
 15 previously stated to the Court that the “focus” of its case was an alleged “exclusive dealing”
 16 agreement between Corcept and Optime. *See* Oct. 31, 2024 Hrg. Tr at 4. What, if anything, Teva's
 17 subpoenas to 33 different healthcare providers have to do with that is not at all clear.

18 For example, Request Nos. 1–2 relate to alleged agreements and transfers of value between
 19 Defendants and the subpoena recipients, No. 3 relates to communications regarding Korlym, Teva,
 20 and potential other generic manufacturers, Nos. 4–6 relate to purported government investigations
 21 into Defendants, Nos. 7–8 relate to services, tools, and resources provided to the subpoena recipients
 22 for prescribing Korlym and receiving reimbursements from payors (like insurers) for the same, No. 9
 23 relates to marketing materials for Korlym, and Nos. 12–13 relate to the cost, safety, and/or efficacy
 24 of Korlym and generics and the comparative impact on patients between Korlym and generics. Ex. A
 25 at 13–15. At least 11 of Teva's 13 requests, then, seem to have little to nothing to do with the
 26 “exclusive dealing” theory—based on a *contractual* provision between Corcept and Optime—that
 27 Teva claims is the focus of its case. *See* Dkt. 39 ¶¶ 1, 131, 141 (Teva operative complaint alleging
 28 Optime is “*contractually* forbidden from distributing any competing products” and challenging

1 alleged “blanket **contractual** exclusivity provision” in alleged “exclusive dealing **contract**”).

2 Teva does assert back-up theories of anticompetitive conduct related to Corcept’s supposed
 3 fraudulent listing of patents in the FDA’s Orange Book, alleged sham patent litigation against Teva,
 4 and purported “bribes” of healthcare practitioners. Dkt. 39 ¶ 5. But **all** of Teva’s requests to the non-
 5 parties appear to have **nothing** to do with Orange Book listings or alleged sham litigation.

6 Even as to Teva’s tertiary “bribery” theory, Teva has failed to justify why it should be the tail
 7 that wags the dog for the parties, much less for 33 **non-parties**. At absolute best, the bribery theory is
 8 peripheral to what Teva claims is the “focus” of its case—the alleged “exclusive dealing” contract
 9 between Corcept and Optime. Moreover the bribery theory does not even give rise to antitrust claims,
 10 as Defendants have explained in their pending motion to dismiss papers. *See* Dkt. 55 at 20–24; Dkt.
 11 68 at 14–15. In addition, the vast majority of the 33 subpoena recipients are **not** even mentioned in
 12 Teva’s complaint. Even as to the handful that are vaguely mentioned in Teva’s complaint, Teva’s
 13 allegations do not themselves justify the invasive discovery Teva seeks. Indeed, Teva’s allegations
 14 are conclusory (not particular), and they are based only on innuendo that contradicts (not supports)
 15 Teva’s allegations, as well as publicly available data that facially indicates the payments are lawful,
 16 particularly given Teva’s own higher payments and defense of them as proper.

17 Further, whatever low probative value of Teva’s desired discovery from the 33 non-parties
 18 Teva claims there may be is vastly outweighed by the disproportionate burdens that the discovery
 19 will impose. Indeed, 31 of the 33 subpoena recipients are **individuals**—doctors, nurse practitioners,
 20 and other medical professionals with patients and staff (the other two are medical centers).
 21 Necessarily, each of the 33 is a “non-party,” a word that “serves as a constant reminder of the reasons
 22 for the limitations that characterize ‘third-party’ discovery.” *Dart Indus. Co. v. Westwood Chem. Co.*,
 23 649 F.2d 646, 649 (9th Cir. 1980). Indeed, “[t]he Ninth Circuit does not favor unnecessarily burdening
 24 nonparties with discovery requests, and, as a result, non-parties deserve extra protection from the
 25 courts.” *Robert Half Int’l Inc. v. Ainsworth*, 2015 WL 4662429, at *4 (S.D. Cal. Aug. 6, 2015)
 26 (cleaned up). The Court’s protection is especially warranted here.

27 As noted *supra*, many of Teva’s requests to the non-parties appear to seek discovery that Teva
 28 also seeks from Corcept or Optime. Defendants are continuing to evaluate Teva’s requests to them,

1 but the parties' discussions should be allowed to reach their completion (and any dispute resolved by
 2 the Magistrate Judge) before Teva burdens the non-parties with its requests. *See J.T. v. City & Cnty.*
 3 *of San Francisco*, 2024 WL 4361579, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 1, 2024) ("when an opposing party and a
 4 non-party both possess documents, the documents should be sought from the party to the case.").

5 Even if Teva's requests did seek some non-overlapping materials from the non-parties, its
 6 subpoenas are overbroad and burdensome. In evaluating the proportionality of a non-party subpoena,
 7 "concern for the unwanted burden thrust upon non-parties is a factor entitled to special weight." *Amini*
 8 *Innovation Corp. v. McFerran Home Furnishings, Inc.*, 300 F.R.D. 406, 409 (C.D. Cal. 2014). Many
 9 of Teva's requests seek "All Documents and Communications" regarding a number of topics. Ex. A
 10 at 13–15. Teva generally defines the "Relevant Time Period" for its Requests as "February 1, 2012
 11 to the present"—a time period of nearly *13 years* (including more than a decade before Teva even
 12 launched its generic in 2024). *Id.* at 12. And, at least one—No. 11 (*id.* at 15)—seems to encompass
 13 *every* document concerning *every* Korlym prescription the subpoena recipient may have prescribed
 14 over those 13 years (which, on its face, would implicate vast amounts of patient and other health
 15 information protected by HIPAA, despite no HIPAA-qualified Protective Order having been entered
 16 yet and there being no indication Teva has tried to comply with HIPAA regulations like 45 C.F.R. §
 17 164.512(e)(ii)). Under the circumstances, Teva's requests are disproportionate, as they would impose
 18 an unnecessary, crushing burden on non-parties, almost all of whom are busy, individual healthcare
 19 practitioners. *See Fed. Trade Comm'n v. DIRECTV, Inc.*, 2015 WL 8302932, at *4 (N.D. Cal. Dec.
 20 9, 2015) (granting party protective order against subpoenas to non-parties, explaining "it is not clear
 21 that the subpoenas are proportional to the needs of this case," "permissible discovery from nonparties
 22 is narrower than that permitted for parties," and it was "unnecessary to burden" the non-parties—who
 23 are "private citizens"—with "the time and expense of collecting responsive documents").

24 **D. TEVA'S SUBPOENAS ARE HARASSING AND DISRUPTIVE**

25 The Court should issue a protective order against Teva's non-party subpoenas for another
 26 independent reason: they are harassing non-parties and also disrupting Defendants' operations.
 27 Indeed, the Court may enter a protective order "to protect a . . . person from annoyance,
 28 embarrassment, [or] oppression." Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c). That is exactly what has happened here.

1 In evaluating whether to issue a protective order, courts consider “whether the information is
2 sought for a legitimate purpose.” *Rivera v. NIBCO, Inc.*, 204 F.R.D. 647, 649 (E.D. Cal. 2001). The
3 circumstances of Teva’s mass subpoena campaign suggest it is a tactical ploy to disrupt the non-
4 parties and Defendants (by getting the subpoena recipients to forego engaging with Defendants due
5 to their being dragged into this case) and ramp up litigation pressure. There is little other explanation
6 for why Teva would: (a) serve non-party subpoenas without first providing notice to the actual parties
7 in the litigation (as Rule 45(a)(4) requires, and as counsel normally does); (b) wait to provide notice
8 until after Defendants raised the issue and the few subpoenas that Conceptor then knew about; (c) then
9 double down by refusing to withdraw the subpoenas and indicating more had been served; and (d)
10 continue to refuse to provide basic information when asked, such as the date each subpoena had
11 actually been propounded or served. That Teva chose to proceed in this manner, with voluminous and
12 largely irrelevant requests that seek to end-run first-party discovery Teva is already seeking from
13 Defendants directly—and all before Protective and ESI Orders have been entered—suggests as much.

14 Even if Teva did not intend the disruption that Teva’s subpoenas caused, it still exists. And it
15 more than provides grounds for relief. *See Wells Fargo & Co. v. ABD Ins.*, 2012 WL 6115612, at *3
16 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 10, 2012) (partially granting protective order to party against non-party subpoenas
17 because plaintiff’s decision to “serv[e] . . . a large number of subpoenas” on a defendant’s business
18 associates had a tendency to “oppress Defendants”); *Accusoft Corp. v. Quest Diagnostics, Inc.*, 2012
19 WL 1358662, at *10–11 (D. Mass. Apr. 18, 2012) (granting protective order against 19 subpoenas to
20 defendants’ customers which defendants contended were “designed to harass by disrupting
21 defendants’ relationships with their customers.”); *Joy Techs., Inc. v. Flakt, Inc.*, 772 F. Supp. 842,
22 849 (D. Del. 1991) (granting protective order against allegedly “harrass[ing]” subpoenas of
23 defendant’s customers because the parties were “fierce competitors” and plaintiff had not
24 demonstrated “a specific need for evidence available only from third party customers.”).

IV. CONCLUSION

26 For the foregoing reasons, Defendants respectfully request that the Court issue a protective
27 order requiring Teva to withdraw its 33 non-party subpoenas.

1 DATED: January 30, 2025

2 By: /s/ Robert W. Stone
3 **QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP**

4 Robert W. Stone (Bar No. 163513)
5 robertstone@quinnemanuel.com
6 555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor
7 Redwood Shores, California 94065
8 Telephone: (650) 801-5000
9 Fax: (650) 801-5100

10 Adam B. Wolfson (Bar No. 262125)
11 adamwolfson@quinnemanuel.com
12 50 California Street, 22nd Floor
13 San Francisco, California 94111
14 Telephone: (415) 875-6600
15 Fax: (415) 875-6700

16 Steig D. Olson (admitted *pro hac vice*)
17 steigolson@quinnemanuel.com
18 51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor
19 New York, New York 10010
20 Telephone: (212) 849-7000
21 Fax: (212) 849-7100

22 *Attorneys for Defendant Corcept Therapeutics, Inc.*

23 By: /s/ Lucas C. Wohlford

24 **Lucas C. Wohlford (admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)**
25 **DUANE MORRIS LLP**
26 100 Crescent Court, Suite 1200
27 Dallas, TX 75201
28 Telephone: +1 214 257 7200
Facsimile: +1 214 257 7201
E-Mail: lwohlford@duanemorris.com

29 Justin J. Fields (SBN 259491)
30 **DUANE MORRIS LLP**
31 Spear Tower
32 One Market Plaza, Suite 2200 San Francisco, CA
33 94105-1127
34 Telephone: +1 415 957 3000
35 Facsimile: +1 415 957 3001
36 E-Mail: jfields@duanemorris.com

37 *Attorneys for Defendant Optime Care Inc.*

CONFER CERTIFICATION

The undersigned hereby attests that counsel for Defendant Corcept and counsel for Plaintiff Teva conferred. Corcept on January 17 requested that Teva withdraw the subpoenas, and Teva on January 20 confirmed unequivocally that Teva would not do so. *See* Declaration of Robert W. Stone, ¶¶ 2–9. The parties were unable to resolve this dispute, as Teva in later correspondence again declined to withdraw the at-issue subpoenas, and today is potentially the 14-day objection deadline for at least one of the subpoenas. *Id.*

Dated: January 30, 2025

By: /s/ Robert W. Stone
Robert W. Stone

CIVIL LOCAL RULE 5-1 ATTESTATION

I, Robert W. Stone, am the ECF user whose credentials were utilized in the electronic filing of this document. In accordance with Civil Local Rule 5-1(i)(3), I hereby attest that concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained from each of the signatories listed above.

DATED: January 30, 2025

By */s/ Robert W. Stone*
Robert W. Stone

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 30th day of January 2025, I electronically transmitted the foregoing document to the Clerk's Office using the CM/ECF System, causing it to be electronically served on all attorneys of record.

By */s/ Robert W. Stone*
Robert W. Stone